



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/216,985	12/21/1998	LAURENCE HONARVAR	1330.1010	8897
21171	7590	02/17/2012	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			SHEIKH, ASFAND M	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.				3627
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2012	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* LAURENCE HONARVAR

---

Appeal 2010-011762  
Application 09/216,985  
Technology Center 3600

---

*Before:* HUBERT C. LORIN, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and  
MICHAEL W. KIM, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

KIM, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1-11, 23-37, and 48-50. We have jurisdiction to review the case under 35 U.S.C. §§ 134 and 6 (2002).

The claimed invention is directed to a decision management system to simultaneously evaluate customer and account data (Spec. 2:3-6). Claim 1, reproduced below, is further illustrative of the claimed subject matter.

1. A computer-implemented decision management process for evaluating a customer of an organization having more than one account, comprising:

loading all customer and account data required for evaluating the customer and each of the accounts into a computer of a decision management system;

evaluating the customer and each of the accounts via an iterative function which uses the loaded customer and account data by a computer of the decision management system, wherein said evaluating determines which strategy of a plurality of strategies will be used to evaluate each account via the iterative function based on a type of the account, and evaluates each account for a same product or service via the iterative function with the same strategy and evaluates accounts for different products or services via the iterative function with different strategies, to thereby produce a respective decision for each of the accounts, the loaded customer and account data being loaded at a time prior to initiating said evaluating and being sufficient to evaluate the customer and each of the accounts by said evaluating without loading additional customer or account data, the customer and each of the accounts thereby being evaluated in a single pass via the iterative function; and

taking an action in accordance with a result of said evaluating.

Claims 1-11, 22-37, and 48-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Walker (US 6,088,686, iss. Jul. 11, 2000) in view of Hoover (US 5,560,005, iss. Sep. 24, 1996).

We REVERSE.

## ANALYSIS

### *Independent Claim 1*

We are persuaded the Examiner erred in asserting that a combination of Walker and Hoover renders obvious independent claim 1<sup>1</sup> (App. Br. 9-11, 14-15). Independent claim 1 recites

evaluating the customer and each of the accounts via an iterative function which uses the loaded customer and account data by a computer of the decision management system... the loaded customer and account data being loaded at a time prior to initiating said evaluating and being sufficient to evaluate the customer and each of the accounts by said evaluating without loading additional customer or account data[.]

For the iterative function, the Examiner asserts that ““iterative function’ is merely the repetitive process of extracting data (monthly debt payments in the Walker system) from each account” (Exam'r's Ans. 9, 10, 11).

However, independent claim 1 recites that the iterative function uses “loaded customer and account data,” which would render the Examiner’s “iterative” data extraction unnecessary. And even if the aforementioned portion of Walker was modified in view of Hoover such that all the data was pre-loaded (Exam'r's Ans. 8, 13), independent claim 1 further recites that it is

---

<sup>1</sup> We choose independent claim 1 as representative of independent claims 1, 23, 26, and 28. See 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

Appeal 2010-011762  
Application 09/216,985

the customers who are evaluated iteratively, which is unrelated to any iterative data extraction asserted by the Examiner.

DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-11, 23-37, and 48-50 is REVERSED.

REVERSED

hh